REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-22. Claims 1, 11-12 and 17 have been amended. The instant specification has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On September 3, 2004, Ronald Pomerenke, representative for the Applicant conducted a telephonic interview with Examiners Christopher R. Navelanko and Vivek Srivastava. Claim 1 was discussed with respect to Ozkan, U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,074. Proposed Claim amendments were discussed. No definite agreements were reached. The Applicant thanks the Examiners for granting this interview.

SPECIFICATION

The instant specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Ozkan, U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,074 (hereinafter, Ozkan). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 1 recites:

> In a digital television receiving system, a method of sharing information comprising the steps of:
>> a) a first device receiving a digital television bit-stream;
>> b) a second device setting a value in an attribute field of a command, said command for requesting information regarding said bit-stream and wherein said value in the attribute field refines identification of information being requested;
>> c) said second device setting at least one flag of a plurality of flags in said command, said step of setting defining the type of information said attribute field describes, wherein the type of information said attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information;
>> d) said second device issuing said command to said first device; and
>> e) said first device responsive to said value of said flag of said command and said value in said attribute field, returning one table of a plurality of tables to said second device

Claim 1 recites limitations of, "said step of setting defining the type of information said attribute field describes, wherein the type of information said attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information." Thus, the attribute field may be used to describe different types of information with the flag field defining the type of information said attribute field describes.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest these claim limitations. Applicants respectfully assert that Ozkan is concerned with the bitstream information itself, as opposed to requests and responses for bitstream information, as contemplated by embodiments of the present invention. Ozkan describes that the processor 60 receives various information about the bitstream and assembles various tables (col. 4, lines 3-

21). Ozkan may teach that Unit 22 directs program specific packets to the processor 60, which *parses, collates, and assembles the information* into hierarchically arraigned tables (col., 3, lines 55-58). Ozkan may also show, in Figure 10, a basic flow of *generating various tables*. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations of, "a second device setting at least one flag of a plurality of flags in said command, said step of setting defining the type of information said attribute field describes, wherein the type of information said attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information."

Claim 1 further recites limitations of, "said first device responsive to said value of said flag of said command and said value in said attribute field, returning one table of a plurality of tables to said second device." Applicants respectfully assert that Ozkan fails to teach or suggest these limitations. With respect to comments in the rejection regarding the user inputting identification numbers to a processor (e.g., remote interface 65 sending numbers 300 and 305), Applicant respectfully notes that Ozkan teaches that various tables are built by the processor <u>prior</u> to the processor causing the tuner to tune to a given frequency in response to a user selecting a channel. For example, the processor derives the tuning parameters from the acquired specific information (e.g., tables) (col. 5, lines 56-61). This means that the tables are not obtained by the processor in response to a user request. Thus, teachings in Ozkan that are concerned with the user selection do not teach or

suggest the limitations of Claim related to *returning one table* of a plurality of tables to said second device.

For the foregoing rationale, Claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Ozkan. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is earnestly requested.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 11 recites, in part:

> a first device having a memory unit for storing a command, wherein said command has a plurality of flags and a plurality of attribute fields, wherein at least one of said attribute fields is operable to store information of different types, and wherein said plurality of flags are configurable to identify the type of information held in said plurality of attribute fields;

> said second device operable to return one table of a plurality of tables from said digital video bit-stream to said first device responsive to a value of said plurality of flags and said value in said at least one of said attribute fields. (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claim 11 is neither taught nor suggested by Ozkan. As such, allowance of Claim 11 is earnestly requested.

Claims 3-9 and 13-16 depend from Claims 1 and 11, which are believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. As such, Claims 3-9 and 13-16 are believed to be allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 10, 12, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ozkan. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 17 recites, in part:

    a) a first device issuing a request for information regarding the content of a digital television bit-stream, said request comprising a command having a plurality of flags which specify the type of information requested and a plurality of attribute fields wherein at least one of said attribute fields is configurable to hold information of different types, wherein the type of information in the at least one of said attribute fields is specified by said plurality of flags, and wherein a value in the at least one of said attribute fields refines identification of information being requested;
    b) a second device connected to said first device receiving said request for information;
    c) based on said plurality of flags and said value in said at least one of said attribute fields, said second device determining one table of a plurality of tables; and
    d) said second device transferring said requested information about the content of said bit-stream to said first device (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons discussed the response to Claim 1, Claim 17 is neither taught nor suggested by Ozkan. As such, allowance of Claim 17 is earnestly requested.

Claims 2, 10, 12, and 18-22 depend from Claims 1, 11, and 17, which are believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. As such, Claims 2, 10, 12, and 18-22 are respectfully believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and remarks presented above, it is

respectfully submitted that Claims 1-22 overcome the rejections of record

and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-22 is respectfully solicited. Should the

Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response,

the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned

representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: __9/7__, 2004

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile